



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NEAR EAST¹

BY JAMES HENRY BREASTED

WITH REMARKS ON WESTERN ASIA

BY DANIEL DAVID LUCKENBILL

No history has yet gathered together and presented the vast and complicated interaction of oriental and Mediterranean civilizations as they commingled in the Mediterranean from the days of early Crete, 3000 B.C., down through the dissemination of Christianity and the expansion of Islam till the Moslems threatened to girdle the Mediterranean; nor does any book available in English present such a survey, even for the earlier period alone, from the beginnings down to the supremacy of the Greeks, as Hall does; that is to say, a survey of the history of man in and around the Mediterranean, from the days when the Stone Age men of the Northern Mediterranean received the first metals from the Nile Valley, down through thousands of years of similar epoch-making contributions from the Orient to the West, millennia of *peaceable* interfusion of the culture of both regions, until a thousand years of experience in imperial government gave to the East, in the hands of Persia, an organization such that it could undertake the *forcible* conquest of these western lands and civilizations over which the East had already gained a supremacy till then founded on the arts of peace. Such a book is an ambitious project, an imposing program, the execution of which involves a more laborious apprenticeship in the use of archaeological tools and philological materials than is demanded in any other historical field, while requiring at the same time the most penetrating analysis and incisive criticism. It may be stated at the beginning that notwithstanding the great difficulty of the task, the author has put together a very valuable survey of the great civilizations in which the Mediterranean world was so deeply rooted. No one can take up the volume without a sense of great indebtedness

¹ *The Ancient History of the Near East: from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Salamis.* By H. R. Hall, M.A., F.S.A. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. xxiii + 602.

for the long and devoted labor involved in its production. I have expressed in another journal a more general appreciation of the work¹ and it may be well in these pages to enter upon more details in its discussion than were possible elsewhere.

It is impossible to make this review even a condensed summary of the book; a critique of some of the main contentions and some suggested corrections are all that can be attempted. The author's position that the civilization of the Nile Valley was decidedly superior to that of the other eastern peoples of the time (e.g., p. 291) is one now adopted by the leading historians of the ancient world; and he therefore devotes more space to that land than to any other of the oriental countries. His chronology of the earliest Mediterranean age is, as in other modern works, based on Egyptian data. The system is not always self-consistent. The Fourth Dynasty in one place (p. 10) is put at 3500 B.C., although the beginning of the dynasties is set at 3600 B.C., notwithstanding the fact that the first three dynasties lasted, on the author's statement, over four hundred years. Again, we find the first king of the Third Dynasty, which "lasted less than a century" (p. 115), placed "two or three centuries before" the Fourth Dynasty (p. 122). The author's system of chronology is seriously affected by his date for the introduction of the calendar, viz., 2781 B.C., seeming to disregard the fact that the Pyramid Texts, which are as a whole vastly older than this date, already contain references to the five intercalary days of the calendar.² In Babylonian chronology Kugler's recent researches on the date of the First Dynasty appeared too late for the author to employ them. The author's date for the important reign of Hammurabi, which he takes from King, viz., about 1950-1900 (p. 28), must therefore be pushed back nearly one hundred seventy-five years; that is, to 2123-2081.

The relations of Asia and Egypt form, of course, one of the author's most important rubrics. He seems to labor slightly under the influence of the old extravagantly early dates for Babylonian civilization. He conjectures that "the Babylonians may well have

¹ *American Historical Review*, April, 1914.

² I am unable to understand why, in the author's table of the Twelfth Dynasty (p. 148), so important for fixing of Aegean dates, the length of Sesostri II's reign is left uncertain. The length of this reign, like all the others of the dynasty, has long since been firmly established (cf. Sethe, *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, XLI, 38 ff.).

passed into the age of metal at an earlier period than did the Egyptians" (p. 30), and states that "the Sumerians apparently knew the use of copper at the beginning of their occupation of Babylonia" (p. 176). But in view of the fact that we have no monuments from the beginning of the Sumerian occupation and that we do not know when it occurred, there appears to be no basis for such a statement. Moreover, the earliest metal in Babylonia is a thousand years later than the earliest metal discovered in Egypt, and the conclusion that the origin of metallurgy belongs in the Nile Valley seems to be incontrovertible. Other archaeological evidence in this connection is subject to question. The author says that the "Syrian winged sphinx" was introduced into Egypt from Asia in Hyksos times (p. 219), but the winged quadruped which is ancestor of both the winged sphinx and the gryphon already occurs on predynastic palettes of Egypt at least as old as the thirty-fifth century B.C. (cf. Capart, *Débuts de l'art*, fig. 156). This *Misch-wesen* certainly passed from Egypt to Asia. Again, the author states that "the Egyptians called the seal by the Semitic name of *khetm*" (p. 89); but the statement that *khetm* is a Semitic word is a pure assumption, for it has long since been recognized that *khetm* as found in Hebrew is a loan word drawn from Egypt, and the Hebrew form, *khôthâm*, "seal ring," displays an un-Semitic vocalization.¹ Neither are the root-consonants Semitic. The important fact follows then that the Semitic-Asiatics borrowed their word for "seal" from Egypt. We find the author also stating, without qualification, that the Egyptian Sun-god bore a Semitic name, and that he was imported from Asia into Egypt (p. 85). The actual situation is that we have in Egypt as the High God a Sun-god on prehistoric monuments a thousand years earlier than any document revealing a Sun-god in Asia, a state of affairs which was a priori to be expected in view of the fact that Egypt is a country enjoying almost cloudless skies the year round. Even if the daring etymology which sees the Hebrew 'or, "light," in *Re'*, the Egyptian Sun-god's name,² were possible, it would reverse the

¹ *Khôthâm* is from *khâthâm*, displaying the vowels: long *ā*, short *ā*, a combination of vowels which is not Semitic, as Barth long ago observed.

² The author equates the Egyptian "r'a" (*sic!*), the Sun-god's name, with "the Semitic 'or'" (*sic!*). Such an equation is exceedingly hazardous on any basis, but the alleged Semitic 'or (even when properly spelled with aleph, not ayin) is never used as a god's name.

author's conclusion; for the Egyptian word *Re'* is two thousand years older than the earliest occurrence of the Hebrew *'ôr*. Similarly it is perfectly clear that the Solar cult was so powerful in Egypt as to contribute to Asia the well-known winged sun-disk adopted by the Assyrians as the symbol of their national god, and then also taken over by the Persians. The only *demonstrable* borrowing is thus against the author's position.

We should like to see another interpretation of the Egyptian word which the author explains as designating "Arabs" in the time of Thutmose III (fifteenth century B.C., p. 251). The Arabs are first mentioned by name as a particular tribe of nomads under the Assyrian Shalmaneser II in the ninth century B.C.

A very common mythological designation of the lands east of Egypt, employed by the Pharaohs, is "God's Land." Our author places the territory indicated by this name ("Ta-neter") as "south of Egypt," especially in the region of the Somali coast (p. 91). This region certainly belonged to "God's Land"; but the inscriptions over and over again apply the term also to Asia, Palestine, and Northern Syria, and more especially North Syria.¹

In a historical review of a long series of civilizations it is difficult not to fall into a mechanical presentation of external events, as contrasted with a survey of processes. In order to avoid this pitfall such a review demands powerful analysis and a penetrating discernment of characteristics. Our author denies the unique individuality of Amenhotep IV, the earliest monotheist in history (p. 298), and finds no difficulty in discovering his like in mere organizers, like Hammurabi or Thutmose III. This can only be due to disregard of the facts, e.g., Hall regards it as questionable whether Osiris "was or was not actually proscribed" (p. 303) by this revolutionary monotheist. Now *every cemetery in Egypt except one is a precinct sacred to Osiris*. The people would not dream of omitting his name and his insignia in every nook and cranny of the tombs; but our monotheist's Amarna cemetery from end to end nowhere discloses either the name or the symbol of Osiris, whom the people buried there were obliged to abandon. This is evidence sufficiently

¹ See my *Ancient Records*, II, §§ 451, 773, 820, 888; III, pp. 116, 434, showing that the term is a vague indication of the East, like our Levant.

conclusive both to settle the case as regards Osiris as well as the unique character of Amenhotep IV. Perhaps these criticisms find their explanation in the fact that the author is so interested in the archaeological materials in a field where they are so plentiful and important, that the book sometimes, and in places, unavoidably becomes an archaeological commentary, a catalogue of *material* documents. The sources, written and unwritten, seem not always to have fused in his mind, to emerge in a symmetrical presentation of the human career revealed in the documents, irrespective of their form. Hence, in the Twelfth Dynasty we find no reference to the epoch-making *literary* development (p. 168), the earliest known chapter in real literary history.

A development in matters archaeological is a more tangible thing than one discernible only in social processes. Hence, as we turn to Asia, we find a full archaeological chronicle, and the question arises whether the social processes which so largely make up the career of the Hebrews should not have been outlined. Some other questions arise. We find ourselves wondering what kind of a Hebrew scribe it was who, somewhere around 1400 or 1500 B.C., before the days of the Amarna Letters and before there was a Hebrew nation, wrote down, as the author alleges (p. 195), the folk-tale of Abraham's adventure, the remarkable rescue of Lot, preserved in Gen., chap. 14. Surely the Hebrews of this age were illiterate, like all nomads, and as even the Greeks were for many centuries after their settlement of Greece. Old preconceptions seem to crop out here, as in the supposition that Jerusalem was the capital of Canaan in the fourteenth century B.C. (p. 356), or that the Hebrews were "a settled nation" in the thirteenth century B.C. (pp. 403, 404, 405, 415), a statement for which the sources furnish no basis. In a book which has employed historical analogy as well as this book has done, one would like to see some reference to the fact that the Hebrew migration was but one in a long series of movements of the nomadic tribes of Western Asia from the grass-lands to the towns, but this involves an interpretation of social phenomena with which, as already mentioned, the book so little deals. The author's dating of the Hebrew Exodus before the beginning of the Egyptian Empire places the whole period of the Judges—indeed, the whole pre-monarchical age of

Hebrew history—in the age of Egypt's sovereignty in Palestine, a sovereignty to which the Hebrew traditions preserved in the Old Testament make not the slightest reference. This would seem to make such a date for the Exodus impossible.

The author's presentation of the civilization of Babylonia is less archaeological than the other portions of his volume, and is a useful summary of recent results based chiefly, in its earlier portions, on King's *Sumer and Akkad*, although it displays commendable independence in disputed matters.

¹ [In discussing Sumerian origins, Mr. Hall rejects the theory of Professor G. Elliot Smith, who sees in the Sumerians the eastern wing of the Mediterranean brunet race, and offers instead, with much reserve, the theory that they were of Indian origin and developed their culture in the east, "perhaps the Indus valley," before coming into Babylonia. Whether this theory will meet with approval remains to be seen. However, it seems that the author lays too much stress upon the "strongly developed nose" of the Sumerians, as seen upon the early monuments, for this is due to the limitations of the primitive sculptor rather than indicative of a racial characteristic. Furthermore, the assertion, frequently seen in print today, that "the Sumerian culture springs into our view ready-made," needs to be made with much more reserve than is usually the case. The excavations in Babylonia have not been extensive or thorough enough to make any definite assertion about the beginnings of the Babylonian culture possible (see Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, I, 2, § 366). The archaeological remains found in the lowest strata at Telloh and Nippur, if they are of Sumerian origin (and nothing points to the contrary), certainly do not give one the impression of any "higher culture" of the Sumerians. The view that the Semites lived in the Euphrates Valley as early as, perhaps earlier than, the Sumerians, and that the latter adopted many of the Semitic deities, should not be spoken of as having been "adumbrated" by Professor Meyer, for this was definitely stated and backed by archaeological evidence by that scholar, and was, in fact, an epoch-making contribution to the understanding of early Babylonian history. There seems to be little evidence which can be adduced for the assertion

¹ The following to the end of the bracket is contributed by D. D. Luckenbill.

(not met with here for the first time) that there was "an ancient unified Sumerian kingdom with its capital at Nippur" (p. 179). That it was an important religious center is evident, but none of the kings' lists which have come down to us indicate that Nippur ever was a political center. The discussion of these and similar points might well have been relegated to the footnotes, for they detract from, rather than add to, the excellent portrayal of the old Sumerian and the First Dynasty civilizations.¹

The presence of an Indo-European element in Asia Minor in the middle of the second millennium B.C. has been demonstrated beyond a doubt by the Boghaz Keui documents, but the statement that "there is little doubt that the Kassites were Indo-Europeans and spoke an Aryan tongue" (p. 201) will hardly be accepted by those who have made a careful study of the thousands of Kassite personal names which we now have collected in a volume by Professor Clay (*Personal Names of the Kassite Period*). Needless to say, the chronology and succession of the Kassite kings given on pp. 262 f. are largely conjectural. In the discussion of early Assyrian history the new texts from Ashur might have been used with profit. One also regrets that so little use seems to have been made of Weber's notes to Knudtzon's edition of the Amarna Letters which have added materially to our understanding of this period of history, besides having removed so many smudges from the blackened characters of the Syrian princes.

In spite of the many points on which one finds himself disagreeing with the author,² one feels safe in asserting that next to,

¹ The names of the heroes of the Gilgamesh Epic should be read Ut-napishtim (in view of the writing U-ta-na-ish-tim) instead of Šit-napishtim; and Engidu instead of Ea-bani (see Gressmann and Ungnad, *Das Gilgamesh Epos*). Nimrod (p. 178) was a Libyan hero, as Erman pointed out years ago (Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.*, I, 2, § 361). On p. 186 read Anu-banini of Lulubu and Lasirab of Gutu instead of Anubanini of Gutu and Lasirab of Lulubu; read E-ulmash instead of E-ulbar. Why Gudea should have gone to the Dead Sea region (p. 189) for asphalt when he might have found it in much greater abundance nearer home is difficult to see (Meyer, *op. cit.*, §§ 411, 441). Reasons for reviving the old theory that Sin-iddinam was "ex-king of Larsam" (p. 193) should be given. There is decided difference of opinion as to Gen., chap. 14. One may say that the majority of Old Testament scholars hold it to be one of the latest, rather than "one of the oldest parts of the Book of Genesis" (p. 194, note).

² To mention a few: The author's discussion of the bondage in Egypt and the Exodus (pp. 403 f.). There is room for much difference of opinion as to the meaning of Levi (pp. 408, 423, note). Is it correct to speak of Samuel as a monotheist (p. 424)? To speak of "a Babylonian scribe" of David's without comment is dogmatic. Was David's kingdom really as extensive as the stories of the Old Testament would have us believe (p. 430)? What does the author mean by "Baalzebel or Jezebel" (p. 450)? The

perhaps before, the discussion of the Cretan civilization, that of the history of Syria and Palestine deserves the highest praise. For freshness and vigor, many of the pages of the sections on the Westland surpass anything that has been written on the subject in recent years.—D. D. LUCKENBILL.]

This is the first book in English which places the Assyrians in their proper perspective. The noble art of the Ninevites, as displayed in relief sculpture, receives due justice, but we should have been glad to see recognized the fact that in spite of obvious limitations, the Assyrian was the first really great civilization in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley, as contrasted with the more limited culture of the merchandizing Babylonians. The treatment of Assyria, however, still suffers somewhat from the old preconception that all it contributed was derived from Babylonia.

The earlier history of the East occupies so large a portion of the book that the discussion of the Persians is less full than that of other oriental peoples. It is in the correlation of the oriental civilizations with that of the Aegean that the particular value of our author's volume lies. His acceptance of Cretan civilization as pre-Indo-Germanic, and of the Mediterranean population who created it, as to a large extent the physical ancestry of the historic Greeks—an ancestry which had meantime absorbed the Greek language, represents an undoubtedly sound position on the basis of the best evidence now available. The East has occupied so much of his space that he is obliged to make his study of early Greece, as he himself states, largely a consideration of external events, and he has therefore been unable to take up the inner development of Greek life in its earlier stages.

The number of difficult and undecided questions in a field like this is of course legion, and it is to be regretted that uncertainty should be introduced where there need be none and where the data are decisive.¹

inscription of Panammu, son of QRL, king of Ya'di (Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 159 f.), is certainly evidence of a "Syrian state named 'Judah'" (we should say Ya'di) (p. 463).

¹ An illustration may be found on p. 234, where the author is dealing with the Asiatic revolt against Thutmose III, which extended from the Upper Euphrates to Southern Palestine. The Egyptian term for the Upper Euphrates region used here is "the marshes of the earth," which Hall says means "the marshes of the land," that is, the land of Egypt;

Few, if any, historical works in English issued in recent years involve the treatment of a mass of material so vast, so varied, and so widely scattered. It is therefore in no spirit of carping criticism, and with full appreciation of the innumerable difficulties and opportunities for going astray that the following corrections are noted. The attribution of the Greek Sphinx of Gizeh to the Twelfth Dynasty (p. 164), a hypothesis first put forward by Borchardt, to whom the author for some reason makes no reference, is a supposition long since discredited. Archaeological data have shown clearly that the Sphinx is a work of the same age which brought forth the Gizeh Pyramids behind it, of which it was the guardian. There can be no question but that it belongs to the Fourth Dynasty, and Borchardt, himself *the author of the theory of later date, has abandoned it*. The so-called "Temple of the Sphinx," the great granite building alongside it, which the author likewise attributes to the Twelfth Dynasty (p. 164), is also a work of the Fourth Dynasty, being the monumental gateway of the vast ramp, or causeway, leading up to the second Pyramid of Gizeh. Again, the magnificent temple of Amenhotep III, which once stood behind the famous "Memnon Colossi," was not destroyed by Ramses II to build his own Ramesseum (pp. 296, 317) but by Ramses' son, Merneptah (Petrie, *Six Temples*, pp. 9, 11). In the same connection it is stated that Strabo called Ramses II's temple the Memnonium "on account of its nearness to the great statues of Amenhotep III, who had long been identified with the Homeric Memnon, owing to a fancied resemblance between his name Men-ma-Ra and that of the Ethiopian hero" (p. 317). Men-ma-Ra, the name of Seti I, has been momentarily confused with Neb-ma-Ra, the name of Amenhotep III, from which it is impossible to derive "Memnon." The old supposition of Lepsius that the Egyptian word *mnw*, meaning "monument," is the source

that is, the marshes of the eastern Delta. All he offers in proof of this interpretation is the words, "this does not mean the country 'from Northwestern Judaea to beyond the Euphrates.'" Had the form of the note been something like this: "A study of the passages in which this term occurs shows," etc., it would be very welcome, for it is by such continued study and restudy of geographical terms that their full meaning may come out, and such further study, correcting an earlier scholar's results, is always to be welcomed. An examination of the fairly large group of passages in which the above geographical terms occur shows that no such study underlies the author's note and the interpretation offered represents merely a momentary *Einfall*, which a study of the term would have made impossible.

of the Greek identification of these colossi of Amenhotep III with Memnon is still the best conjecture available. It is a further misunderstanding which would represent the Egyptians as transporting stone for the marking of their northern *limes* in Asia, or their southern in Ethiopia, from the quarries near Cairo (p. 254). Amenhotep II's architect in charge of the quarry, in an inscription on the quarry wall, merely boasts, as a former achievement, of having been intrusted with the execution of the *limes* landmarks at the northern and southern extremities of the empire, but he makes no statement that he took the stone for these landmarks from the Egyptian quarries, which would have been an extraordinary occurrence indeed.

The earliest appearance of bronze as an alloy harder than copper is a very important question. Our author states that bronze was unknown in Egypt until the Middle Kingdom (p. 33), whereas, if we are to trust the examination of Mosso (*Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization*, pp. 56, 57), the Pepi statues of the Sixth Dynasty contained over 6½ per cent of tin, and Petrie has also found bronze in the Old Kingdom. Presumably the author means that bronze was not in common use until the Middle Kingdom, which is of course a fact. The magnificent Soleb lions now in the British Museum, which were so much admired by Ruskin, have been a fruitful source of misunderstanding in the hands of earlier writers; the author is under a misapprehension in his statement that I have ascribed the ancient removal of these statues to King "Amenisru" (p. 274). The passage in my *Ancient Records* (II, 363, note *d*) leaves the question of the king's name open and merely calls him "the Ethiopian." In discussing the question of Cretan palace decoration, more particularly wall-painting, the author contrasts such Cretan paintings with those of Egypt by emphasizing the insertion of numerous inscriptions by the Egyptian artist (p. 51). This of course applies not to Egyptian *palaces* but to Egyptian *temples*, and the sensitive, probably mutual, interchange of influence between the wall-painting of the Cretan and Egyptian palaces is evident. At the opening of the Old Kingdom in Egypt it is of some importance to note that the tomb chamber of Khasekhemui at Abydos is not of "granite" (p. 113) but of limestone. The stonecutters of this early age were not yet ready for granite masonry, though they did lay a granite pavement. The

embossed leather of the empire displays one of the most beautiful techniques of the Egyptian craftsman, but the chariot of Thutmose IV is not of "embossed leather" (p. 294) but of incised stucco. It would be well to introduce as soon as possible Loret's demonstration that the royal bird of the Pharaohs was the falcon, and not the "hawk," which is employed by the author (pp. 93, 99, *et passim*). The usurper, Harmhab, as I and others have incorrectly supposed and the author still affirms (p. 311), did not marry Mutnezhmet, a princess of the legitimate line. This misapprehension has been corrected by Sethe (*Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, XLIV, 35-36). The Ethiopian capital of the earliest monotheist, Ikhnaton, is inadvertently placed at Napata (p. 275). This lost city, identified by the University of Chicago Expedition, was at Sesebi, at the Third Cataract, whereas Napata is at the Fourth. There seems to be a similar confusion in regard to Karoy, the southern frontier of the Egyptian empire, which was at the Fourth, not the Third, Cataract (p. 270). For the author's assertion that this region was conquered early in the Eighteenth Dynasty by Amenhotep I (p. 271) there is no evidence. The southernmost inscription of Amenhotep I was found by the University of Chicago Expedition in the Third Cataract region. It was Amenhotep's successor, Thutmose I, who conquered the Sudan and absorbed the Dongola Province. The Punt expedition of Hatshepsut cannot be dated in the year nine (p. 298), but had already returned by that year.*

* Some translations of less importance demand notice: The Pharaonic title "Golden Horus" (p. 93) is a late misunderstanding by the Egyptians themselves. We know now that, as shown in a late Greek translation, it means "Horus victorious over Set." The author's statement (p. 332) that Set and Sutekh are two different gods identified is somewhat misleading. The most recent evidence has shown clearly that they are not two gods, but one, and that the name "Set" is but a mutilation of that which we call "Sutekh." The name of the great monotheist Amenhotep IV's (Ikhnaton's) capital "Akhetaton," so familiar to Orientalists under its modern name, Tell-el-Amarna, does not mean "Glory of the Disk" (p. 301), which is a confusion with the *king's* name, but "horizon of the disk." In the archaic inscription on the magnificent Philadelphia alabaster jar of Besh, the date: "Year of smiting the northern enemy" should read "Year of smiting *and fighting* the northern enemy" (p. 112). In making new translations for historical use, as the author states he has done in some cases in his volume,

The author's style is forcible and interesting. His extraordinary fondness for the unusual word "apogee" is very noticeable; it even occurs twice in one sentence. The thirty-three plates of illustrations are excellent and well chosen. It is inevitable, as we have said before, in a work covering so large an area of history and so vast an array of sources, written and unwritten, that opportunities for difference of opinion should be very frequent and that numerous

it is important to use *all* the ancient versions as a basis. The text of the great *limes* inscription of Sesostris III in Berlin is corrupt in places; the correction of these from the duplicate discovered by Steindorff and now in Leipzig would have avoided some errors in the rendering (p. 162). The place where the Berlin copy was erected, now called "Semneh," has no connection with an ancient Egyptian "Samnin." This alleged ancient Egyptian "Samnin" (p. 161) does not exist, but is an old misreading of Maspero's perpetuated in his *History (Dawn of Civilization, p. 485, n. 2)*. The inscription cited by Maspero as containing it is misread (see my *Ancient Records, I, § 752*). The unique character of the reign of the monotheist, Amenhotep IV, would, I think, have been much more evident to the author if his translations had included the new stela of Tutenkhaton, which makes it perfectly clear how completely the monotheist swept away the old gods (see my *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt, pp. 344, 345*). Further use of Knudtzon's new *Amarna Letters* would also alter some important passages (p. 245).

In matters more technically philological, the reading of the Egyptian word for "foreign countries, high-lands" is not *khaskheti* (pp. 107, 157, 212 *bis*), but *ḥ'st*; or, using our author's vocalization, *ḥaset*. The title of the Hittite king in the treaty of peace between Ramses II and the Hittites is not *p-sar-'o n Kheta* (p. 364) but *p-ver-'o n Kheta*. A *sar* is an *Egyptian* official, and the title is not applied to foreigners. *Apet-esut*, that is, Karnak, has nothing to do with *Apet-resit* (Luxor) (p. 278), as the two Egyptian words thus transliterated are always written differently in hieroglyphic and are two totally different words, as has been recently shown. The rendering "Two River-Land" (p. 229) for *Naharin* is without basis as far as the "two" is concerned (for *Naharin* is a *plural* form) and is of course due to the author's recollection of the Hebrew form *Aram-Naharaim*, but it is doubtful whether this Hebrew term contains a dual. The "blacksmiths," *Mesni'u* (p. 92), should have the consonants *msntyw*. The Egyptian word commonly rendered "troglodytes," which the author twice reads "Anu" (pp. 89, 92), should be read only *Antiu (yntyw)*, a reading which he also recognizes (p. 95). The rendering of this word as "troglodytes" is due solely to the fact that the people it designates are found commonly in regions

pitfalls of a most deceptive character should beset the way. If much of this review is devoted to such inevitable differences and corrections, I wish nevertheless again to express my appreciation of the devoted industry which the author has brought to his task and to emphasize my confidence in the usefulness of the valuable survey of man's early career which he has put together.

where Strabo places troglodytes, and is not based upon an impossible etymology connecting it with the word *ant* (*ynt*), "valley." The explanation of the epithet of Anubis in Egyptian, *ymy-wt* (*Am-U^t*), which the author gives as "He who is in the Oasis" (p. 101), remains without demonstration and without support in the inscriptions. The corruption *ymy-wtf* (*am-u^t-f*) assumed by the author does not exist, but arises from his confusing it with *tp-dwf* meaning "on his mountain," a frequent epithet of Anubia.

We may add here some misprints, or clerical errors, which are not numerous in the Book: for "Nekebit" (p. 112), read "Nekhebit"; for "XI" (148 *bis*), read "XII"; for "offices" (p. 247), read "officers"; for "Rameses II (Menophres)" (p. 316), read "Rameses I"; for "Jenson" (p. 329), read "Jensen"; for "Rameses XII" (p. 390), read "Rameses XI"; for "come" (p. 557), read "came"; for "builder" (p. 136), read "building"; delete "on" (p. 95, last line).